



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/868,375 | 06/18/2001 | Anton Oguzhan Alford Andrews | PHN-17.707 | 8890 |
| 24737 | 7590 | 12/01/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510 | | | VU, THANH T | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2174 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p align="center">Office Action Summary</p> | <p>Application No.</p> <p align="center">09/868,375</p> | <p>Applicant(s)</p> <p align="center">ANDREWS ET AL.</p> | |
| | <p>Examiner</p> <p align="center">Thanh T. Vu</p> | <p>Art Unit</p> <p align="center">2174</p> | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p> |
|--|---|

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Appeal Brief filed 09/19/2005. This action is made Final.

Applicant's arguments in the Appeal Brief, filed 09/19/2005, with respect to the rejections of claims 27-29 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The final rejection of claims 27-29 is withdrawn. Upon further consideration, new grounds of rejections are made as described below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. "a graphical user interface for user with a data processing device, comprising" is non-statutory for at least the reason that it is not tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2174

Claims 23-26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. ("Straub", U.S. Pat. No. 6,215,141), and Flutka et al. ("Flutka", U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,934).

Per claim 23, Straub teaches a graphical user interface for use with a data processing device comprising:

a screen (fig. 5; 140 and 144);

a plurality of display elements for displaying on the screen, the elements comprising (fig. 5; element 142 and 144);

at least one personal selection zone, disposed within a strip to be displayed around a peripheral of the screen (fig. 5; personal selection zone 144; col. 8, lines 26-57); and

a presentation zone for presenting information selected at the personal selection zone (fig. 5; presentation zone 142; col. 8, lines 26-57).

Straub does not teach the screen is adapted for use in a horizontal plane. However Flutka teaches a screen is adapted for use in a horizontal plane (fig. 1; see Abstract; col. 2, lines 45-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a screen is adapted for use in a horizontal plane as taught by Flutka in the invention of Straub in order to improve the health of the computer operator and to provide for an unimpeded forward line of sight by the computer operator.

Per claim 24, Straub teaches the user interface of claim 23, wherein the personal selection zone is a flow zone comprising a moving list of links (fig. 5; links: MSN news, ESPN Sports, NEWS... col. 8, lines 53-56, and lines 60-67).

Per claim 25, Straub teaches the interface of claim 24, wherein the display elements further comprises at least one flow control element, a respectively flow control

Art Unit: 2174

element being disposed adjacent to each flow zone (fig. 5; elements 164 and 162; col. 9, lines 5-8 and lines 24-32).

Per claim 26, Straub teaches the interface of claim 24, further comprising a plurality of control zones disposed together for effecting control of other display elements (col. 9, lines 18-23 and lines 33-46).

Per claim 30, Flutka teaches a table comprising the user interface of claim 23 and adapted for a respective user to sit adjacent to each personal selection zone (fig. 1; col. 2, lines 43-51).

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. ("Straub", U.S. Pat. No. 6,215,141), Flutka et al. ("Flutka", U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,934), and Sidana (U.S. Pat. No. 6,081,829).

Per claim 27, Straub teaches the interface of claim 26, wherein the control zones comprise: an agent zone for selecting filtering agents for filtering contents of the flow zone, a mode zone for altering a format of other zones (figs. 7; annotation zone 198; col. 9, lines 18-23; col. 10, lines 5-15 and lines 32-48), but does not teach an annotation zone for annotating information in the presentation zone. However, Sidana teaches an annotation zone for annotating information in the presentation zone (col. 2, lines 23-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Sidana in the invention of Straub and Flutka in order to enable a user to store custom information (such as user comments) associated with a web document.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. ("Straub", U.S. Pat. No. 6,215,141), Flutka et al. ("Flutka", U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,934), Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,350), and Barraus et al. ("Barraus", U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,652).

Per claim 28, Straub and Flutka teaches the interface of claim 23, but do not teach the interface further comprising at least one token zone for displaying personal links wherein the personal links may be dragged to other zones to affect what is displayed in the other zones. However, Bates teaches an interface comprising at least one token zone for displaying personal links (fig. 14, col. 3, line 59-col. 4, line 6). Barraus teaches links may be dragged to other zones to affect what is displayed in the other zones (fig. 15; col. 25, line 55-col. 26, line 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Bates and Barraus in the invention of Straub and Flutka in order to provide user with an improved manner for creating bookmarks and organizing and presenting such bookmark, and in order to automatically generating a thumbnail image of a web page.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Straub et al. ("Straub", U.S. Pat. No. 6,215,141), Flutka et al. ("Flutka", U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,934), Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,350), Barraus et al. ("Barraus", U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,652), and Selker (U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,098).

Per claim 29, the modified Straub teaches the interface of claim 28, but does not teach wherein the token zone is in the form of carousel. However, Selker teaches wherein

Art Unit: 2174

the token zone is in the form of carousel (fig. 4 and 7; col. 1, lines 51-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Selker in the invention of the modified Straub in order to provide an improved method for presenting a list of information to a user.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments in the Amendment have been fully considered. Those directed to claims 27-29 are moot in view of the new rejections. The other arguments are addressed below.

Applicant's primary argument is that Fluka does not teach "a screen is for use in a horizontal plane". The examiner does not agree because Fluka reads on the claim language of a screen is adapted for use in a horizontal plane (col. 2, lines 50-54). In that it has a tilted screen in the horizontal plane of the desk.

Applicant also points out that Straub does not teach a flow zone with a moving list of links. The examiner does not agree because Straub teaches a flow zone with a moving list of links (fig. 5; links: MSN news, ESPN Sports, NEWS... col. 8, lines 53-56, and lines 60-67; links are displayed one after another in a sequential order when the user selects buttons 162, and 164).

In addition, applicant points out that Straub does not teach the limitations of claim 25. The examiner does not agree because Straub's reference reads on the claim language of one flow control element, a respective flow control element being disposed adjacent to each flow zone (fig. 5; flow control 164 and 162; col. 9, lines 5-8).

Art Unit: 2174

In addition, applicant points out that Fluka does not teach the limitation of claim 30. The examiner does not agree because Fluka reads on the claim language of a table comprising the user interface of claim 23 and adapted for a respective user to sit adjacent to each personal selection zone (fig. 1; col. 2, lines 43-51; a user can sit next to the table of Fluka.)

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2174

T. Vu

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100